

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S087346 William Hamilton et al., Plaintiffs and Respondents
v.
Maryland Casualty Company, Defendant and Appellant
The judgment of the Court of Appeal is affirmed.

Werdegarr, J.

We Concur:

George, C.J.
Kennard, J.
Baxter, J.
Chin, J.
Brown, J.
Moreno, J.

S097344 Summit Financial Holdings, Ltd., Plaintiff and Respondent
v.
Continental Lawyers Title Company, Defendant and Appellant
We decline to adopt a rule that would, by subjecting an escrow holder to conflicting obligations, undermine a valuable business procedure, and we therefore affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeal.

Brown, J.

We Concur:

George, C.J.
Kennard, J.
Baxter, J.
Werdegarr, J.
Chin, J.
Moreno, J.

Concurring Opinion by Werdegarr, J.

I Concur:

Moreno, J.

S009038 In re Robert M. Sanger, Attorney at Law

People, Respondent

v.

Richard Dean Turner, Appellant

At the conclusion of the March 6, 2002, hearing on this matter, the court made the following rulings in open court:

1. The court found Robert M. Sanger in contempt of court and indicated that a formal judgment, embodying the court's findings and the sanction to be imposed, would be filed at a later date.

2. The court ordered Robert M. Sanger to complete a full draft of appellant's opening brief in this case and submit it to the California Appellate Project on or before April 5, 2002. He was further ordered to complete appellant's opening brief in this case and lodge it with the court on or before May 6, 2002. If the completed brief is not lodged with the court on or before May 6, 2002, the court will consider issuing an order directing Robert M. Sanger to show cause before this court, when the matter is ordered on calendar, why he should not be held in contempt of court a second time and why an additional sanction should not be imposed for his continuing delay of the appellate process. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1218, subd. (a).) Sanger was further ordered to appear before the court at its May 2002 oral argument calendar, at a specific time and date to be set in the future.

Orders were filed in the following matters extending the time within which to grant or deny a petition for review to and including the date indicated, or until review is either granted or denied:

A088687/S103748 People v. William Moalem – April 16, 2002.

A091926/S103720 People v. Richard Marcum Quilopras – April 18, 2002.

A094073/S103677 In re Victor F., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law; People v. Victor F. – April 15, 2002.

C029333/S103689 People v. Scott Alen Jones – April 15, 2002.

S102357 In re Sue Marcella Hamby
 on
 Habeas Corpus

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file petitioner's reply to the Attorney General's informal response is extended to and including March 25, 2002.

S026614 People, Respondent
 v.
 James Gregory Marlow, Appellant

Appellant's request to permit filing of supplemental brief is granted.

S102634 In re Samuel J., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law

People, Respondent
v.

Samuel J., Appellant

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, First District Appellate Project is hereby appointed to represent appellant on his appeal now pending in this court.

Appellant's brief on the merits shall be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date respondent's opening brief on the merits is filed.

S102904 People, Respondent
 v.
 Robert Ordaz, Appellant

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, James Dippery is hereby appointed to represent appellant on his appeal now pending in this court.

Appellant's brief on the merits shall be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

4th Dist. Callender
G028076 v.
Div. 3 Marie Callender Pie Shops, Inc.

The above-entitled matter, now pending in the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, is transferred from Division Three to Division One.

Bar In the Matter of the Application of the Committee of Bar Examiners
Misc. of the State of California for Admission of Attorneys
4186

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED TO ORIGINAL ORDER)

Misc. Appointment of State Bar Court Judge
2002-1

Pursuant to section 6079.1 of the Business and Professions Code, and Rule 961 of the California Rules of Court, Judith A. Epstein, selected by the Supreme Court from a list submitted by the Applicant Evaluation and Nomination Committee, is hereby appointed as a State Bar Court Review Department Judge for a term to commence on the date on which she takes her oath of office through November 1, 2004.

**SUPREME COURT CALENDAR
LOS ANGELES SESSION
APRIL 2 and 3, 2002
(First Amended)**

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom in the Ronald Reagan State Office Building, 300 South Spring Street, 3rd Floor, North Tower, Los Angeles, California on April 2 and 3, 2002.

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 2002 - 9:00 A.M.

S097857	People v. Johnson
S088829	Allen v. Sully-Miller Contracting
S097456	Rice v. Clark

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2002 - 9:00 A.M.

S094710	People v. Anderson (To be called and continued to May calendar.)
S099665	American Equity Insurance v. Beck
S099938	Musser v. Provencher
S097340	People v. Bland

2:00 P.M.

S097104	Jefferson v. California Department of Youth Authority
S094039	People v. Sinohui
S010808	People v. Jack Gus Farnam (Automatic Appeal)

GEORGE

Chief Justice

If exhibits are to be transmitted to this court, counsel must comply with Rule 18(c), California Rules of Court.